

## **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of April 30, 2007 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 6-12 as allegedly anticipated by Day publication 126. Claims 3-5 are rejected over Day in view of Helger patent 374 and Stanchfield patent 920.

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants assert that the difference between the invention and the cited art is the snap-fit connector portion at the bottom of the tube. The claimed snap-fit is not the attachment of the connector portion to the bottom of the tube proper. Day shows a label chamber which is snap-fit to the tube. However, the invention has a snap-fit connector portion at the other end for engagement with the bottom of a bore in a multi-well plate. In other words, the snap fit is not to secure the tip to the tube, but to engage a corresponding part in a multi-well plate into which the tip is engaged.

Claim 1 has been amended in order to clarify this point. As can be appreciated from the claim as filed, the snap-fit is at the "other end". The amendment makes it clear that the other end has a snap-fit for engaging bore of the multi-well plate. It is believed that this amendment does not in any way change the scope of the claim and it should not be interpreted as an additional limitation. The amendment merely clarifies what was presented in claim 1 as filed, namely the position of the snap-fit connector.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider his rejection of the claims, the allowance of which is earnestly solicited.

If additional fees are required, the Director is authorized to charge Deposit Account 504147 or credit any overpayment thereto.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. De Luca

**ELECTRONICALLY SIGNED**

/John P. De Luca/

Registration No. 25,505

Attorney for Applicant

John P. De Luca  
17420 Ryefield Ct.  
Dickerson, MD 20842  
301 349 2899  
[jpd@jpdip.net](mailto:jpd@jpdip.net)